

Crystallising the depth rule for WZNW fusion coefficients

A.N. Kirillov[†], P. Mathieu[†], D. Sénéchal^{†1} and M.A. Walton^{#2}

[†] *Département de Physique, Université Laval, Québec, Canada G1K 7P4*

[#] *Physics Department, University of Lethbridge
Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada T1K 3M4*

Abstract

Motivated by a formula (due to Zelobenko) for finite Lie algebra tensor products, we propose a reformulation of the Gepner-Witten depth rule. Implementation of this rule remains difficult, however, since the basis states convenient for calculating tensor product coefficients do not have a well-defined depth. To avoid this problem, we present a ‘crystal depth rule’, that gives a lower bound for the minimum level at which a WZNW fusion appears. The bound seems to be quite accurate for $su(N > 3)$, and for $su(3)$ the rule is proven to be exact.

9/92

¹ Present address: Département de Physique, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke (Québec), Canada J1K 2R1

² Talk given by M.W. at the XIXth International Colloquium on Group Theoretical Methods in Physics, June 29 - July 4, 1992, Salamanca, Spain.

Consider the decomposition of the tensor product of two integrable highest weight representations $L(\lambda)$ and $L(\mu)$ of a finite semi-simple Lie algebra g :

$$L(\lambda) \otimes L(\mu) = \oplus_{\nu} N_{\lambda\mu}^{\nu} L(\nu) . \quad (1)$$

One has [1]:

$$N_{\lambda\mu}^{\nu} = \dim \left\{ |\mu' \rangle \in L_{\nu-\lambda}(\mu) \mid e_i^{\lambda_i+1} |\mu' \rangle = 0 \ (i = 1, \dots, \text{rank}(g)) \right\} , \quad (2)$$

where $L_{\nu-\lambda}(\mu) \subset L(\mu)$ is the subspace of states of $L(\mu)$ of weight $\nu - \lambda$, the λ_i are the Dynkin labels of the highest weight λ , and e_i is the raising operator corresponding to the simple root α_i of g .

To each highest weight λ satisfying $k \geq (\lambda, \theta)$ one can associate a primary field ϕ_{λ} of the WZNW model of algebra g and fixed level $k \in \mathbf{Z}_+$. The operator products of the primary fields decompose in a way very similar to (1). To symbolise this, we write

$$L(\lambda) \times L(\mu) = \oplus_{\nu} N_{\lambda\mu}^{(k)\nu} L(\nu) , \quad (3)$$

calling $\times$ a fusion product, and the $N_{\lambda\mu}^{(k)\nu}$ fusion coefficients.

The constraints in (2) arise because if one acts on the highest state $|\lambda \rangle$ of $L(\lambda)$ with the lowering operator f_i (corresponding to the simple root α_i of g) a sufficient number $(\lambda_i + 1)$ of times, the result vanishes. These constraints must be obeyed by the fusions (3), as well as by the tensor products (1). Now the primary field ϕ_{λ} creates the highest state of an integrable highest weight representation of the untwisted affine Kac-Moody algebra $\hat{g}_k$ associated to g , at level k . The affine algebra has one extra simple root α_0 compared to g , and so for the fusions, we find an extra condition.

From this condition it can be shown [2] that a given $L(\nu)$ of the right hand side of (1) will not be part of the right hand side of (3) unless for all $|\mu' \rangle \in L(\mu)$, $|\nu' \rangle \in L(C\nu)$ ³ obeying $|\mu' \rangle \otimes |\nu' \rangle \in L(C\lambda)$, we have

$$f_{\theta}^p |\mu' \rangle \otimes f_{\theta}^l |\nu' \rangle = 0 , \quad (4)$$

for all $p + l \geq k - (\lambda, \theta) + 1$. Here f_{θ} is the lowering operator corresponding to the highest root θ of g . This constraint on couplings between 3 WZNW primary fields is known as the depth rule.

³ $L(C\nu)$ is the representation contragredient to the representation $L(\nu)$.

I report here an investigation of the depth rule as a practical method of calculating the fusion coefficients $N_{\lambda\mu}^{(k)\nu}$ [3]. For simplicity, we restricted to $g = su(N)$.

First, notice the striking difference between (4) and (2). The latter allows the calculation of tensor product coefficients using the simple Littlewood-Richardson rule. One hopes something similar is possible for fusion coefficients. Therefore, imitating (2), we used the following ‘strong’ depth rule:

$$N_{\lambda\mu}^{(k)\nu} = \dim \left\{ |\mu'\rangle \in L_{\nu-\lambda}(\mu) \mid e_i^{\lambda_i+1} |\mu'\rangle = f_\theta^{k+1-(\lambda,\theta)} |\mu'\rangle = 0 \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where $i = 1, \dots, \text{rank}(g)$, as in (2).

Second, a basis $B_{\nu-\lambda}(\mu)$ of states $|\mu'\rangle \in L_{\nu-\lambda}(\mu)$ must be chosen. One might hope to find a basis such that

$$\text{if } |\mu'\rangle \in B_{\nu-\lambda}(\mu), \text{ then either } e_i |\mu'\rangle \in B_{\nu-\lambda+\alpha_i}(\mu) \text{ or } e_i |\mu'\rangle = 0. \quad (6)$$

That is, a nonvanishing $e_i |\mu'\rangle$ is a single pure element of $B_{\nu-\lambda+\alpha_i}(\mu)$, rather than a linear combination of basis states. This is impossible for all i , however. What we can choose is a basis of $L_{\nu-\lambda}(\mu)$ such that by simply dropping some of the states, the remaining truncated set spans the full set of states obeying the constraints of (2) (compare with [4]). In fact, there exists a canonical basis [5] [6] parametrised by Gelfand-Tsetlin patterns (GT states) which is a ‘good’ basis in this sense [7], and this property ‘explains’ why the Littlewood-Richardson rule for $su(N)$ tensor products works.

One needs to decide whether the GT states remain a ‘good’ basis when the extra constraint of (5) is imposed, i.e. when fusions are considered instead of tensor products. Unfortunately, we have not (yet) answered this question.

We did nevertheless make some progress motivated by quantum groups. It is simple to show using the quantum group $\mathcal{U}_q(g)$ that the GT states form a good basis for the calculation of tensor product coefficients $N_{\lambda\mu}^{(k)\nu}$. The tensor product coefficients of $\mathcal{U}_q(g)$ are identical for all generic q , including $q = 1$ (where we have been working) and $q = 0$. Furthermore, the GT patterns label basis states for both values of q . So we can work at $q = 0$, with Kashiwara’s ‘crystal base’ [6]. These states obey property (6), as can be seen from ‘crystal graphs’. And so it becomes clear that the GT states are ‘good’ for tensor products.

Now, the GT states at $q = 0$ are also ‘good’ with respect to the full set of constraints of (5). But this cannot be used to say anything about fusion coefficients, because they are identical to the tensor product coefficients of $\mathcal{U}_q(g)$ at q equal to a root of unity, i.e. non-generic q . Nevertheless, if we pretend the states at $q = 1$ behave as if they were those at $q = 0$, we obtain remarkably good results.⁴ We call the corresponding depth rule the ‘crystal depth rule’.

We proved that the crystal depth rule is exact for $su(3)$, and so provides a simple efficient method for calculating $su(3)$ WZNW fusion coefficients. For $su(N > 3)$, we found evidence that it gives a good lower bound on the minimum level at which a given coupling appears.

To conclude we present the $su(3)$ crystal depth rule, using the symmetric form of the Littlewood-Richardson rule for $su(N)$ found by Berenstein and Zelevinsky [8]. The tensor product coefficient $N_{\lambda\mu}^{C\nu}$ is just the number of triangles having labels $0 \leq a_i \in \mathbf{Z}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& & a_1 + a_2 = \lambda_1 \\
& & a_3 + a_4 = \lambda_2 \\
& a_4 & a_4 + a_5 = \mu_1 \\
a_3 & a_5 & a_2 + a_3 = a_6 + a_8 \\
& & a_3 + a_5 = a_9 + a_8 \\
a_2 & a_6 & a_6 + a_7 = \mu_2 \\
& & a_5 + a_6 = a_2 + a_9. \\
a_1 & a_9 & a_8 & a_7 \\
& & a_7 + a_8 = \nu_1 \\
& & a_9 + a_1 = \nu_2
\end{array} \quad \text{such that} \quad (7)$$

Suppose the triangle’s labels satisfy $a_2 \leq \min(a_5, a_8)$. (If they don’t we can always rotate the triangle such that they do.) Then the fusion coefficient $N_{\lambda\mu}^{(k) C\nu}$ is simply the number of these obeying $k \geq k_0 = a_4 + \nu_1 + \nu_2$.

⁴ There was one complication, however. The resulting rule was not invariant under the cyclic permutation of the three weights $\lambda, \mu, C\nu$. So, it was necessary to take the strongest of the three constraints (5), with permuted highest weights.

References

- [1] D.P. Zelobenko, *Compact Lie Groups and Their Representations* (Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society, 1973); Theorem 4, section 78.
- [2] D. Gepner and E. Witten, *Nucl. Phys.* **B278** (1986) 493.
- [3] A.N. Kirillov, P. Mathieu, D. Sénéchal and M.A. Walton, preprint LAVAL-PHY-20/92(LETH-PHY-2/92), 2/92, to appear in *Nucl. Phys.* **B**.
- [4] I.M. Gelfand and A.V. Zelevinsky, in the Proceedings of the third seminar, Yurmala, May 22-24, 1985 (Moscow, Nauka, 1986).
- [5] G. Lusztig, *J. Am. Math. Soc.* **3** (1990) 447.
- [6] M. Kashiwara, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **133** (1990) 249.
- [7] O. Mathieu, *Geometricae dedicata* **36** (1990) 51
- [8] A.D. Berenstein and A.V. Zelevinsky, ‘Triple multiplicities for $sl(R+1)$ and spectrum of the exterior algebra of adjoint representation’, Cornell technical report ‘90-60 (9/90).